

Editorial: Effects of noise on organisms: from mechanisms to ecological consequences

Alejandro A. Ríos-Chelén^{1*} David A. Luther² Dominique A. Potvin³ Christopher N. Templeton⁴

¹Tlaxcala Center for Behavioral Biology, Autonomous University of Tlaxcala, Tlaxcala, Mexico

²Biology Department, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, United States

³School of Science, Technology and Engineering, University of the Sunshine Coast, Petrie, QLD, Australia

⁴Biology Department, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, United States

Editorial on the Research Topic

Effects of noise on organisms: from mechanisms to ecological consequences

While the second half of the 18th century brought great industrial and technological development to much of the western world, it also generated an unprecedented rise in anthropogenic noise. Although initially overshadowed by more noticeable hazards such as air quality, negative effects of anthropogenic noise on human health have been in the spotlight of considerable scientific research in recent decades (reviewed in Stansfeld et al., 2000; Alves et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2023). Indeed, pervasive urban noise is now considered one of the worst damaging environmental factors for human health (World Health Organization, 2011). It has been linked with a higher risk of cardiovascular problems (Basner et al., 2014; Vienneau et al., 2022), cancer (Andersen et al., 2018; Sørensen et al., 2021), obesity (Pyko et al., 2015; Cai et al., 2020) and diabetes (Sakhvidi et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2020). However, its effects on non-human species have been comparatively less studied. Noise is a global pollutant with effects extending far beyond its source (Buxton et al., 2017; Jerem and Mathews, 2020). Mounting evidence demonstrates its damaging effects on both aquatic and terrestrial taxonomic groups (Shannon et al., 2016; Kunc and Schmidt, 2019), potentially at several levels of biological organization, including the individual, population, community, and ecosystem (Reijnen and Foppen, 1994; Francis et al., 2009; Barber et al., 2011; Proppe et al., 2013; Shannon et al., 2016; Kunc et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2021).

While it is intuitive to think that humans and other species would benefit by reducing anthropogenic noise, it is important to have an accurate understanding of the mechanisms by which noise pollution impacts the living world, its ecological effects, and extent to which biological systems would be able to return to a basal “health state” if noise is reduced. Progress has been made in this regard (reviewed in Shannon et al., 2016; Kunc et al., 2016; Kunc and Schmidt, 2019; Jerem and Mathews, 2020), but much more research is still needed if we want to truly grasp the deep and diverse ways in which noise can impact organisms at varying levels of organization. This information can bring more awareness to decision makers and aid in future legislation to mitigate its effects. At the same time, it has

the added benefit of increasing our understanding of how noise shapes intra- and inter-specific interactions, and ultimately ecological processes, sexual selection, and evolution.

In this Research Topic we collected the newest, and state-of-the-art, research on the effects of noise on organisms. From this new knowledge and updated guidelines can be drawn to mitigate the effects of noise. At the same time, this Research Topic highlights gaps of knowledge that need to be addressed in the future, and new questions and avenues of research.

We have collected seven papers; four address the impact of noise on behavior, at the individual level (Azarm-Karnagh et al.; Chávez-Mendoza et al.; Rhodes et al.; Ritz-Radlinská et al.), two focus on multispecies effects (Kleist et al.; Rosa and Koper), and one contribution is an up-to-date review of the effects of noise at the community level (Kok et al.). While five studies focus on birds (Chávez-Mendoza et al.; Rhodes et al.; Ritz-Radlinská et al.; Kleist et al.; Rosa and Koper), one studies a shrimp (Azarm-Karnagh et al.), and the review by Kok et al. addresses a wide diversity of taxonomic groups. The study by Azarm-Karnagh et al. experimentally shows that red cherry shrimps (*Neocaridina davidi*) can perceive anthropogenic noise and that it can have negative effects on their spatial distribution, latency to find food, and foraging success. With a playback experiment, Chávez-Mendoza et al. studied the vermilion flycatcher (*Pyrocephalus rubinus*) to answer the question of whether noise-induced changes in vocal signals increase the probability of detection. While finding no support for this hypothesis, they give evidence that anthropogenic noise makes individuals more aggressive when defending a territory. Rhodes et al. investigated how a prolific singer and vocal mimic bird, the gray catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*), adapts its vocal behavior to noise and features of urbanization (degree of impervious and canopy surface). They show that not only noise, but also urban features, predict acoustic attributes of gray catbird songs. The study by Ritz-Radlinská et al. evaluated whether and how, traffic noise, habitat type, and other environmental factors (e.g. temperature, wind speed) are associated to, among other variables, the length of song sequences from yellowhammers (*Emberiza citrinella*). The authors found significant interactions between noise and habitat type and temperature, showing that the effect of noise on bird song can be more complex than previously predicted. This complexity was also highlighted by the six-year study by Rosa and Koper evaluating the effects of noise infrastructure and different types of anthropogenic noise on abundance and nesting success across four songbird species. They showed species-specific effects not only of noise, but also of noise infrastructure. Kleist et al. evaluated different types of anthropogenic noise (aircraft noise, vehicle noise, and noise from people) on the vocal activity of avian communities in several national parks in the United States. They found that after a peak of anthropogenic noise there is a peak in vocal activity; however, this peak in activity was followed by reduced bioacoustic activity for at least 3 hours after noise exposure, showing noise can have a lasting effect on vocal activity at an ecosystem level. Finally, the review by Kok et al. addressed the effects of noise on communities; they included studies published since 1970 on plants, worms, arthropods, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. The authors explain the wide impact of noise on

communities through direct effects (e.g. on the individual) and indirect effects (e.g. via trophic interactions) and highlight some gaps of knowledge and future directions to mitigate the effects of noise.

We hope this Research Topic will aid in our understanding of some of the mechanisms and consequences that underly the effects of noise at several levels of biological organization, at different time spans (short term, long term), and at different spatial scales (local and larger geographical scales).

Author contributions

AR-C: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. DL: Writing – review & editing. DP: Writing – review & editing. CT: Writing – review & editing.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to all researchers who contributed to this Research Topic and to the Frontiers team who let us co-edit this Research Topic.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

Alves J. A., Paiva F. N., Silva L. T., Remoaldo P. (2020). Low-frequency noise and its main effects on human health—a review of the Literature between 2016 and 2019. *Appl. Sci.* 10, 5205. doi: 10.3390/app10155205
CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar

Andersen Z. J., Jørgensen J. T., Elsborg L., Lophaven S. N., Backalarz C., Laursen J. E., et al. (2018). Long-term exposure to road traffic noise and incidence of breast cancer: a cohort study. *Breast Cancer Res.* 20, 119. doi: 10.1186/s13058-018-1047-2
PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar

Barber J. R., Burdett C. L., Reed S. E., Warner K. A., Formichella C., Crooks K. R., et al. (2011). Anthropogenic noise exposure in protected natural areas: estimating the scale of ecological consequences. *Landscape Ecol.* 26, 1281–1295. doi: 10.1007/s10980-011-9646-7

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Basner M., Babisch W., Davis A., Brink M., Clark C., Janssen S., et al. (2014). Auditory and non-auditory effects of noise on health. *Lancet* 383, 1325–1332. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)61613-x

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Buxton R. T., McKenna M. F., Mennitt D., Fristrup K., Crooks K., Angeloni L., et al. (2017). Noise pollution is pervasive in U.S. protected areas. *Sci.* 356, 531–533. doi: 10.1126/science.aah4783

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Cai Y., Zijlema W. L., Sørgerd E. P., Doiron D., de Hoog K., Hodgson S., et al. (2020). Impact of road traffic noise on obesity measures: observational study of three European cohorts. *Environ. Res.* 191, 110013. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.110013

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Francis C. D., Ortega C. P., Cruz A. (2009). Noise pollution changes avian communities and species interactions. *Curr. Biol.* 19, 1415–1419. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2009.06.052

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Jerem P., Mathews F. (2020). Trends and knowledge gaps in field research investigating effects of anthropogenic noise. *Conserv. Biol.* 35, 115–129. doi: 10.1111/cobi.13510

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Kunc H. P., McLaughlin K. E., Schmidt R. (2016). Aquatic noise pollution: implications for individuals, populations, and ecosystems. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 283, 20160839. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2016.0839

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Kunc H. P., Schmidt R. (2019). The effects of anthropogenic noise on animals: a meta-analysis. *Biol. Lett.* 15, 20190649. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2019.0649

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Phillips J. N., Termondt S. E., Francis C. D. (2021). Long-term noise pollution affects seedling recruitment and community composition, with negative effects persisting after removal. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 288, 20202906. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2020.2906

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Proppe D., Sturdy C. B., St. Clair C. C. (2013). Anthropogenic noise decreases urban songbird diversity and may contribute to homogenization. *Global Change Biol.* 19, 1075–1084. doi: 10.1111/gcb.12098

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Pyko A., Eriksson C., Oftedal B., Hilding A., Östenson C. G., Krog N. H., et al. (2015). Exposure to traffic noise and markers of obesity. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 0, 1–8. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2014-102516

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Reijnen R., Foppen R. (1994). The effects of car traffic on breeding bird populations in woodland. I. Evidence of reduced habitat quality for willow warblers (*Phylloscopus trochilus*) breeding close to a highway. *J. App Ecol.* 31, 85–94. doi: 10.2307/2404601

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Sakhvidi Z., Sakhvidic F. Z., Mehrparvar A. H., Foraster M., Dadvand P. (2018). Association between noise exposure and diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ. Res.* 166, 647–657. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2018.05.011

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Shannon G., McKenna M. F., Angeloni L. M., Crooks K. R., Fristrup K. M., Brown E., et al. (2016). A synthesis of two decades of research documenting the effects of noise on wildlife. *Biol. Rev.* 91, 982–1005. doi: 10.1111/brev.12207

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Sørensen M., Poulsen A. H., Kroman N., Hvidtfeldt U. A., Thacher J. D., Roswall N., et al. (2021). Road and railway noise and risk for breast cancer: A nationwide study covering Denmark. *Environ. Res.* 195, 110739. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2021.110739

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Stansfeld S., Haines M., Brown B. (2000). Noise and health in the urban environment. *Rev. Environ. Health* 15, 1–2. doi: 10.1515/reveh.2000.15.1-2.43

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Vienneau D., Saucy A., Schäffer B., Flückiger B., Tangermann L., Stafoggia M., et al. (2022). Transportation noise exposure and cardiovascular mortality: 15-years of follow-up in a nationwide prospective cohort in Switzerland. *Environ. Int.* 158, 106974. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2021.106974

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Wang H., Sun D., Wang B., Gao D., Zhou Y., Wang N., et al. (2020). Association between noise exposure and diabetes: meta-analysis. *Environ. Sci. pollut. Res.* 27, 36085–36090. doi: 10.1007/s11356-020-09826-6

[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

World Health Organization (2011). Burden of disease from environmental noise. Quantification of healthy life years lost in Europe (Copenhagen, Denmark: European Commission).
[Google Scholar](#)

Yang L., Gutierrez D. E., Guthrie O. W. (2023). Systemic health effects of noise exposure. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health Part B.* 27, 21–54 doi: 10.1080/10937404.2023.2280837
[CrossRef Full Text](#) | [Google Scholar](#)